

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,237	03/10/2004	Paulus Antonius Augustinus Hofte	9177	2993
	7590 01/31/2001 R & GAMBLE COMPA	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTU	AL PROPERTY DIVIS	SPISICH, MARK		
WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS 01/31/2007			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/797,237	HOFTE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
-	Mark Spisich	1744
The MAILING DATE of this communication		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Monthle, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		·
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) T	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the applicati	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	·
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) objected to	o by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	rection is required if the drawir	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	J	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in	Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have bee	en received in this National Stage
application from the International Bur	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l	list of the certified copies no	ot received.
•		
Attachment(s)	مسلما	. Summon (DTO 412)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	· —	f Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other: _	·

Art Unit: 1744

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-9, drawn to a cleaning implement with an auxiliary cleaning tool, classified in class 15, subclass 115.
 - II. Claims 10-19, drawn to a cleaning implement (with an auxiliary cleaning tool) with a universal joint and locking mechanism, classified in class 15, subclass 144.2.
 - III. Claims 20-27, drawn to a cleaning tool, classified in class 15, subclass 229.11.
 - IV. Claims 28-31, drawn to a method of scrubbing, classified in class 134, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are directed to related cleaning implements. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are divergent with the first group requiring a particular "cleaning tool" and no particular handle connection and the second group a broad "cleaning tool" with a particular connection between the mop head and handle (universal joint with locking member). Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass

Art Unit: 1744

overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

3. Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the cleaning tool of claim 1 does not require the securing member on the grip portion. The subcombination has separate utility such as being used by itself and not used while attached to a mop head (or even attached to some other primary cleaning implement and not a mop).

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Inventions II and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed

Art Unit: 1744

does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the broad cleaning tool in claim 10 lacks many of the limitations of the cleaning tool of claim 20 (head portion, grip portion, securing member). The subcombination has separate utility such as use by itself and not necessarily while attached to a primary cleaning member (let alone one with the universal joint of claim 10).

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

5. Inventions IV and (I,II or III) are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another

Art Unit: 1744

and materially different apparatus, such as a mop head with simply a scrubbing portion thereon and not part of a distinct "cleaning tool" (as required by claims 1,10 and 20).

- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: **Upon the election of either Group I or Group III**, an election of one of the cleaning tools from the group (1) Figs 2-3; (2) Fig 4; (3) Fig 5); (4) Fig 8; and (5) Fig 9 and **upon the election of Group II**, an election of one of the locking mechanisms from the group (1) Fig 11; (2) Fig 12; (3) Fig 13; (4) Fig 14; (5) Fig 18; and (6) Fig 19. The species are independent or distinct because the are, unless indicated otherwise by applicant, assumed to be patentably distinct embodiments of the disclosed cleaning implement.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

Art Unit: 1744

finally held to be allowable. Currently, for example, claim 1 would be generic to all of the cleaning tools as well as all of the handle/head connections.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Art Unit: 1744

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Spisich whose telephone number is (571) 272-1278. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (5:30-3:00), Alternate Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1744

7,237 Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Spisich
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1744

MS